

Some Noncommutative Geometric Aspects of $SU_q(2)$

by

Debashish Goswami

*Indian Statistical Institute, Kolkata Centre; 203, B.T. Road,
Kolkata-700108, India.*

email : goswamid@hotmail.com

Abstract

We study various noncommutative geometric aspects of the compact quantum group $SU_q(2)$ for positive q (not equal to 1), following the suggestion of Connes and his coauthors ([9], [8]) for considering the so-called true Dirac operator. However, it turns out that the method of the above references do not extend to the case of positive (not equal to 1) values of q in the sense that the true Dirac operator does not have bounded commutators with “smooth” algebra elements in this case, in contrast to what happens for complex q of modulus 1. Nevertheless, we show how to obtain the canonical volume form, i.e. the Haar state, using the true Dirac operator.

Sub. class : 81R50, 58B34, 81R60

Keywords : quantum groups, noncommutative geometry, covariant calculus, Dirac operator.

1 Introduction

Noncommutative geometry (introduced by A. Connes ([4], [5])) and the theory of quantum groups (introduced and studied by Drinfeld [11], Jimbo [13], Woronowicz [15] and others) are two important and rapidly growing areas of the so-called “noncommutative mathematics”, both having close interactions with and applications to diverse branches of mathematics and mathematical physics (e.g. quantum gravity). Since almost all the popular and well-known examples of quantum groups are in some sense “deformed” or “twisted” versions of some classical Lie groups, which are also differentiable manifolds and play a central role in classical differential geometry, it is quite natural to investigate the relation between Connes’ noncommutative geometry and the theory of quantum groups. Such a connection was made by Woronowicz himself in his pioneering paper [15], where he formulated and studied the notions of differential forms and de-Rham cohomology in the context of $SU_q(2)$. Since then, many authors including Woronowicz,

Podles and others have studied such questions quite extensively and a rich theory of covariant (and bicovariant) differential calculus has emerged. However, a number of questions in the interface of noncommutative geometry and quantum groups still remains open. In particular, the “naive” approach (in the language of [9]) taken by some authors including Bibikov, Kulish, Woronowicz, Podles and others to build a suitable theory of noncommutative differential geometry in the context of quantum groups suffered from some serious disadvantages. One of the major difficulty is that various “naive” Dirac operators introduced by these authors (e.g. [1]) do not have the property that the commutators of such Dirac operators with the elements of a distinguished dense subalgebra are bounded. Without this property of having bounded commutators, it is not possible to carry out most of the canonical general constructions done in Connes’ framework. Furthermore, the spectral properties of such Dirac operators or the associated “naive” Laplacians are quite strange in some sense.

To overcome the above difficulty, Connes and his coauthors (see [9], [8]) have recently suggested a better candidate of Dirac operator, termed as the “true” Dirac operator in [9], in the context of some quantum groups, including $SU_q(2)$. However, their framework includes only the case where q is complex of modulus 1, but we are interested in the case where q is positive and not equal to 1. We shall show that a similar definition of Dirac operator does **not** work for such q ’s. In fact, if we denote by D the true Dirac operator suggested by [9] and [8] in this case, then $[D, a]$ is not bounded for a in the distinguished “smooth” algebra, even though $[|D|, a]$ is bounded. Nevertheless, we show how to obtain the Haar state from the Laplacian, i.e. D^2 .

2 Notation and Preliminaries

Before we enter into the discussion on $SU_q(2)$, let us discuss little bit about classical compact Lie groups. Let G be a compact d_0 -dimensional Lie group, equipped with an invariant Riemannian metric, and h be the Hilbert space $L^2(G, \mu)$, where μ is the normalized Haar measure. If we consider h as canonically embedded in the Hilbert space of differential forms, and if C denotes the restriction of the Hodge Laplacian onto h , then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0+} t^{d_0/2} \text{Tr}(\exp(-tC))$ exists and is nonzero, and furthermore, $\text{Tr}(f \exp(-tC)) = v(f) \text{Tr}(\exp(-tC))$ for any continuous function f on G , viewed as a multiplication operator on h , and where $v(f) = \int f d\mu$. However, as we shall shortly see, such classical intuition is no longer valid for quantum groups, but we can recover

some aspects of it by introducing an appropriate modified formulation of noncommutative geometry.

Let us now describe the compact quantum groups $SU_q(2)$. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be the C^* -algebra associated with the quantum group $SU_q(2)$ as defined in [15] (q positive number), i.e. the universal unital C^* -algebra generated by $\alpha, \gamma, \alpha^*, \gamma^*$ satisfying $\alpha^* \alpha + \gamma^* \gamma = 1, \alpha \alpha^* + q^2 \gamma^* \gamma = 1, \gamma^* \gamma = \gamma \gamma^*, \alpha \gamma = q \gamma \alpha, \alpha \gamma^* = q \gamma^* \alpha$. We shall take q to be greater than 1, but remark that all our results will be valid also when $0 < q < 1$, which can be seen by obvious modifications at a few steps of the proofs of some of the results. Let $\mathcal{A}^\infty$ denote the $*$ -algebraic span of α, γ . Let Φ, κ and ϵ denote the coproduct, antipode and counit respectively, as defined in [15]. We recall the construction of the normalized Haar state ψ on $\mathcal{A}$, and let h be the L^2 space associated with this state. As usual, we denote by $t_{ij}^n, i, j = -n, \dots, n; n = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, \dots$ the matrix elements of the unitary irreducible co-representations, so that $\text{span}\{t_{ij}^n, (t_{ij}^n)^* : n, i, j\} = \mathcal{A}^\infty$, and $\Phi(t_{ij}^n) = \sum_k t_{ik}^n \otimes t_{kj}^n, \kappa(t_{ij}^n) = (t_{ji}^n)^*$. To avoid any confusion, we choose the following explicit definition of these matrix elements. Let $x_{nj} = \alpha^{n+j}(\gamma^*)^{n-j}, n = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \dots; j = -n, \dots, n$, and let $y_{nj} = \frac{x_{nj}}{\psi(x_{nj}^* x_{nj})^{\frac{1}{2}}}$. Then we define t_{ij}^n by the relation $\Phi(y_{nj}) = \sum_i y_{ni} \otimes t_{ij}^n$.

It is easy to verify that $\langle t_{ij}^m, t_{kl}^n \rangle := \psi((t_{ij}^m)^* t_{kl}^n) = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} \delta_{mn} [2n+1]_q^{-1} q^{2i}$, where δ_{rs} is the Kronecker delta symbol and $[r]_q := \frac{q^r - q^{-r}}{q - q^{-1}}$. Furthermore, $\psi(t_{ij}^m (t_{kl}^n)^*) = \delta_{ik} \delta_{jl} \delta_{mn} [2n+1]_q^{-1} q^{-2j}$. We consider the orthonormal basis of h given by $\{t_{kl}^{\tilde{n}} := t_{kl}^n [2n+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}} q^{-k}\}$.

3 The “true” Dirac operator on $SU_q(2)$ and some geometric consequences

We shall follow the suggestion of [9] to define and study the “true” Dirac operator and formulate an appropriate modification of Connes’ spectral triple. First of all, let us recall the construction of the “naive” Dirac operator as in [1], to be denoted by Q . Let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the Hilbert space $C^2 \otimes h$, $h = L^2(\mathcal{A}, \psi)$ as defined earlier. We denote by $\pi_l, l = 0, \frac{1}{2}, 1, \frac{3}{2}, \dots$ the $(2l+1)$ -dimensional irreducible corepresentation of $SU_q(2)$ respectively, and identify the first tensor component C^2 of $\mathcal{H}$ with the space of $\pi_{\frac{1}{2}}$, denoting by $e_+ \equiv |\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\rangle, e_- \equiv |\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\rangle$ the canonical orthonormal basis associated with this corepresentation. We define the following distinguished vectors of $\mathcal{H}$:

$$v_{ij}^{l,+} := C_{\frac{1}{2}, j-\frac{1}{2}, j}^{\frac{1}{2}, l, l+\frac{1}{2}} e_+ \otimes \tilde{t}_{i, j-\frac{1}{2}}^l + C_{-\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}, j}^{\frac{1}{2}, l, l+\frac{1}{2}} e_- \otimes \tilde{t}_{i, j+\frac{1}{2}}^l,$$

$$v_{ij}^{l,-} := C_{\frac{1}{2},j-\frac{1}{2},j}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l-\frac{1}{2}} e_+ \otimes \tilde{t}_{i,j-\frac{1}{2}}^l + C_{-\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2},j}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l-\frac{1}{2}} e_- \otimes \tilde{t}_{i,j+\frac{1}{2}}^l;$$

where $C_{k,l,m}^{a,b,c}$ denote the q -Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, mentioned in [1] (the notation of [1] was $\begin{bmatrix} a, b, c \\ k, l, m \end{bmatrix}_q$ for our $C_{k,l,m}^{a,b,c}$). The “naive” Dirac operator Q (denoted by [1] as D_q) is a self-adjoint operator having $C^2 \otimes_{alg} \mathcal{A}^\infty$ in its domain and having $v_{ij}^{l,+}, v_{ij}^{l,-}, i, j = -l, -l+1, \dots, l; l = 0, \frac{1}{2}, \dots$ as a complete set of eigenvectors with eigenvalues $[l]_{q^2}$ and $-[l+1]_{q^2}$ corresponding to $v_{ij}^{l,+}$ and $v_{ij}^{l,-}$ respectively. We now define the “true” Dirac operator to be the self-adjoint operator D with the same eigenvectors as above, but the corresponding eigenvalues being $l + \frac{1}{2}$ and $-(l + \frac{1}{2})$ respectively. It is to be noted that D is related to Q by the relation $[D - \frac{1}{2}I]_{q^2} = Q$, and thus this D is a trivial modification of the one suggested by [9], by just adding $\frac{1}{2}I$ to their original prescription. We let $\mathcal{A}$ act on $\mathcal{H}$ by $a \mapsto (I_2 \otimes a)$, and we also denote $(I_2 \otimes a)$ by a , without any possibility of confusion. Our first task is to verify whether the remark made by [9] holds true in the present context, i.e. for q positive (not 1).

Theorem 3.1 $[|D|, a]$ is bounded for any $a \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$.

Proof :-

(1) Clearly, $|D|$ is of the form $I_2 \otimes A$, where A is the operator with $\tilde{t}_{ij}^n$'s as a complete set of eigenvectors with $n + \frac{1}{2}$ as the corresponding eigenvalue. Thus, we have to show $[A, a]$ is bounded for $a \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$. It is enough to show it for $a = t_{ij}^n$, or equivalently, for $\tilde{t}_{ij}^n$, which is a constant multiple of t_{ij}^n . Let us fix some $n = n_0, i = i_0, j = j_0$. We note that

$$\tilde{t}_{ij}^n \tilde{t}_{kl}^n = \sum_{p=|n-m|, |n-m|+1, \dots, n+m} B(n, m, p; i, j, k, l) \tilde{t}_{i+k, j+l}^p.$$

Let $v \in h$ be given by $v = \sum_{n,i,j} v_{ij}^n \tilde{t}_{ij}^n$. Let us make the following notational convention : $\tilde{t}_{ij}^n$ will be set equal to 0 if any of the indices i, j falls outside the range $\{-n, -n+1, \dots, n\}$. We then have,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| [A, \tilde{t}_{i_0 j_0}^n] v \|^2 \\ &= \left\| \sum_{n,i,j} v_{ij}^n \sum_{p=|n-n_0|, |n-n_0|+1, \dots, n+n_0} B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j) (p - n) \tilde{t}_{i_0+i, j_0+j}^p \right\|^2 \\ &= \sum_{p,i,j} \left| \sum_{n: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} v_{ij}^n B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j) (p - n) \right|^2. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, the number of n satisfying $|n - n_0| \leq p \leq n + n_0$ is at most $2n_0 + 1$, and furthermore, for any such n , $|p - n| \leq n_0$, so that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left| \sum_{n: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} v_{ij}^n B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j) (p - n) \right|^2 \\ & \leq (2n_0 + 1) n_0^2 \sum_{n: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} |v_{ij}^n|^2 (B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j))^2. \end{aligned}$$

From this, we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} & \| [A, t_{i_0 j_0}^{\tilde{n}_0}] v \|^2 \\ & \leq (2n_0 + 1) n_0^2 \sum_{p, i, j} \sum_{n: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} |v_{ij}^n|^2 (B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j))^2 \\ & = (2n_0 + 1) n_0^2 \sum_{n, i, j} |v_{ij}^n|^2 \sum_{p: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} (B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j))^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, we note that for any fixed n, i, j , $\sum_{p: |n-n_0| \leq p \leq n+n_0} (B(n_0, n, p; i_0, j_0, i, j))^2 = \| t_{i_0 j_0}^{\tilde{n}_0} t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}} \|^2 \leq C^2 \| \tilde{t}_{ij}^{\tilde{n}} \|^2 = C$, where $C = \| t_{i_0 j_0}^{\tilde{n}_0} \|^2$ is a constant. It is clear that $\| [A, t_{i_0 j_0}^{\tilde{n}_0}] v \|^2 \leq C^2 \| v \|^2$, which completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Remark 3.2 *However, it is not true that $[D, a]$ is bounded for a as above; in particular for $a = \tilde{t}_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}$, $[D, a]$ is not bounded. It is easy to see that for $a = t_{\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}}^{\tilde{\frac{1}{2}}}$ and any $l \geq \frac{1}{2}$,*

$$av_{ij}^{l,+} = \sum_m b_m^+(i, j) v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m,+} + \sum_m b_m^-(i, j) v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m,-},$$

where the range of m is $\{l - \frac{1}{2}, l + \frac{1}{2}\}$, and

$$b_m^\epsilon(i, j) = \sum_{m_1 = \frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}} C_{m_1, j-m_1, j}^{\frac{1}{2}, l, l+\frac{1}{2}} C_{\frac{1}{2}, i, i+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, l, m} C_{\frac{1}{2}, j-m_1, j-m_1+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, l, m} C_{m_1, j+\frac{1}{2}-m_1, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}, m, m+\frac{1}{2}\epsilon} \frac{[2]_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}} [2l+1]_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2m+1]_{\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

for $\epsilon = +, -$. Now, it is straightforward to verify that $[D, a] v_{ij}^{l,+} = \sum_m \{ (m-l) b_m^+(i, j) v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m,+} - (m+l) b_m^-(i, j) v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m,-} \}$. Since $v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m, \epsilon}$ are clearly orthogonal for different choices of the pair (m, ϵ) , it follows that $\| [D, a] v_{ij}^{l,+} \|^2 = \sum_{m, \epsilon} |m-l|^2 |b_m^\epsilon(i, j)|^2 \| v_{i+\frac{1}{2}, j+\frac{1}{2}}^{m, \epsilon} \|^2$. Hence, if $[D, a]$ is bounded, the quantity

$\frac{|l+\epsilon'\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon l|^2 |b_{l+\epsilon'\frac{1}{2}}^\epsilon(i,j)|^2 \|v_{i+\frac{1}{2},j+\frac{1}{2}}^{l+\epsilon'\frac{1}{2},\epsilon}\|^2}{\|v_{ij}^{l,+}\|^2}$ must be bounded as $l, i, j, \epsilon, \epsilon'$ ($\epsilon' = +, -$) are allowed to vary.

We note the following values of the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients, which are taken from [2], with the care that one has to replace q in the formulae of that book by q^{-2} to apply it to our case.

$$C_{\frac{1}{2},m,m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l+\frac{1}{2}} = q^{\frac{l-m}{2}} \frac{[l+m+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}, C_{-\frac{1}{2},m,m-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l+\frac{1}{2}} = q^{-\frac{l+m}{2}} \frac{[l-m+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}},$$

$$C_{\frac{1}{2},m,m+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l-\frac{1}{2}} = q^{-\frac{l+m+1}{2}} \frac{[l-m]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}, C_{-\frac{1}{2},m,m-\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l-\frac{1}{2}} = -q^{\frac{l-m+1}{2}} \frac{[l+m]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Using these expressions and after some straightforward simplification, we see that the coefficient $b_{l+\frac{1}{2}}^-(i,j)$ is given by,

$$b_{l+\frac{1}{2}}^-(i,j) = \frac{q^{\frac{l-3j-\frac{1}{2}}{2}} [l-j+\frac{1}{2}]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+1]_q [2l+2]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}} \left([l+j+\frac{1}{2}]_q - [l+j+\frac{3}{2}]_q \right) C_{\frac{1}{2},i,i+\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2},l,l+\frac{1}{2}} \frac{[2]_q^{\frac{1}{2}} [2l+1]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}{[2l+2]_q^{\frac{1}{2}}}.$$

Now, putting $j = -l - \frac{1}{2}, i = l$ in the above expression, it is easy to see that the absolute value of the above quantity converges to a finite nonzero number as $l \rightarrow \infty$, and thus there is a strictly positive lower bound of this sequence

for large l . It is also simple to check that $\frac{\|v_{i+\frac{1}{2},-l}^{l+\frac{1}{2},-}\|}{\|v_{i,-l-\frac{1}{2}}^{l,+}\|}$ converges to a strictly positive limit as $l \rightarrow \infty$ (in fact the above quantity is independent of i).

Thus, $|2l + \frac{1}{2}| |b_{l+\frac{1}{2}}^-(l, -l - \frac{1}{2})| \frac{\|v_{i+\frac{1}{2},-l}^{l+\frac{1}{2},-}\|}{\|v_{i,-l-\frac{1}{2}}^{l,+}\|}$ is clearly unbounded as l grows,

proving our claim that $[D, \tilde{t}_{\frac{1}{2},\frac{1}{2}}^{\frac{1}{2}}]$ is unbounded.

Remark 3.3 We have verified that $(\mathcal{A}^\infty, \mathcal{H}, |D|)$ is a spectral triple in the sense of Connes. In fact, this is a “compact” one, since by construction D has compact resolvents. But such a spectral triple with a positive Dirac operator is very bad from an algebraic or topological point of view, since the Fredholm module associated with the sign of $|D|$ is trivial, and hence its pairing with the K -theory is trivial too. Thus, in some sense this spectral triple fails to capture “topological” information of the underlying noncommutative space, i.e. the C^* -algebra.

However, if we forget for the time being the topological aspects and concentrate on the more geometric aspects such as the volume form, then it is $|D|$ and not D itself which is important. But even in this respect, the present example has subtle differences from Connes' standard formulation, and we shall study these issues now, leading to a modification of Connes' definition and methods. First of all, let us note that if we take the usual prescription of noncommutative geometry to obtain the "volume form", i.e. if we take the functional $a \mapsto \text{Lim}_{t \rightarrow 0+} \frac{\text{Tr}(a \exp(-tD^2))}{\exp(-tD^2)}$ (where "Lim" is a suitable Banach limit discussed in [12]), then we shall get a trace by the general theory, and hence the above functional cannot be the canonical Haar state ψ . So, the natural question is : how to recover ψ from the above spectral data ? The answer which we are going to provide requires an additional information, namely an operator ρ described in the following fundamental theorem.

Theorem 3.4 *Let B be any bounded operator on h such that $Bt_{ij}^{\tilde{n}} = \lambda_n t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}}, \forall n, i, j$, and let ρ denote the operator on h given by $\rho(t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}}) = q^{-2i-2j} t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}}$. Assume that ρB is trace-class (i.e. it has a bounded extension which is trace-class), and define a functional ϕ on $\mathcal{A}$ by $\phi(a) = \text{Tr}(\rho B)$. then we have that $\phi(a) = \psi(a)\phi(1)$.*

Proof :-

We first recall the results obtained by Baaĳ and Skandalis [3], from which it follows that there is a unitary operator W acting on $h \otimes h$, such that $\Phi(a) = W(a \otimes I_h)W^*$. Furthermore, it can also be verified that $W^*(c \otimes 1) = (id \otimes \kappa)\Phi(c)$ for any $c \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$, viewed as an element of h . Thus, in particular, $W^*(t_{ij}^n \otimes 1) = \sum_k t_{ik}^n \otimes (t_{jk}^n)^*$. Now, using the notation of [15], we denote by $\phi * \psi$ the functional $a \mapsto (\phi \otimes \psi)(\Phi(a))$. It follows from the definition of the Haar state that $(\phi * \psi)(a) = \psi(a)\phi(1)$. But on the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned}
(\phi * \psi)(a) &= \sum_{n,i,j} \langle t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}} \otimes 1, W(a \otimes 1)W^*((\rho B t_{ij}^{\tilde{n}}) \otimes 1) \rangle \\
&= \sum_{n,i,j,k,l} [2n+1]_q q^{-2i} \langle t_{ik}^n \otimes (t_{jk}^n)^*, q^{-2i-2j} \lambda_n (a t_{il}^n) \otimes (t_{jl}^n)^* \rangle \\
&= \sum_{n,i,j,k} \langle t_{ik}^{\tilde{n}}, a t_{ik}^{\tilde{n}} \rangle q^{-2i-2j-2k} \lambda_n [2n+1]_q^{-1} \\
&= \sum_{n,i,k} \langle t_{ik}^{\tilde{n}}, a \rho B(t_{ik}^{\tilde{n}}) \rangle ([2n+1]_q^{-1} \sum_j q^{-2j}) = \text{Tr}(a \rho B) = \phi(a).
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the facts that $\langle (t_{jk}^n)^*, (t_{jl}^n)^* \rangle = \delta_{kl} q^{-2k} [2n+1]_q^{-1}$, and $\sum_{j=-n, -n+1, \dots, n} q^{-2j} = [2n+1]_q$. $\square$

Thus, we obtain the Haar state, i.e. the canonical volume form in this case, as follows :

Theorem 3.5 *Let R be the operator on $\mathcal{H}$ defined by $R = I_2 \otimes \rho$. Then we have the following*

- (1) R is a positive unbounded operator having an unbounded inverse R^{-1} , such that $\mathcal{D} := C^2 \otimes_{alg} \mathcal{A}^\infty \subseteq \mathcal{H}$ is an invariant core for R ,
- (2) $\mathcal{D}$ is also an invariant core for $|D|$ and on this domain R commutes with $|D|$,
- (3) For $a \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$, there is a unique bounded extension of RaR^{-1} belonging to $\mathcal{A}^\infty$,
- (4) For any $t > 0$ and $a \in \mathcal{A}$,

$$\frac{\text{Tr}(a \text{Rexp}(-tD^2))}{\text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2))} = \psi(a).$$

Hence in particular, $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{\text{Tr}(a \text{Rexp}(-tD^2))}{\text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2))} = \psi(a)$.

The proof is straightforward and hence omitted.

We can define an automorphism of $\mathcal{A}^\infty$ (not adjoint-preserving) given by, $\Psi(a) = RaR^{-1}$. It can be shown that $\psi(ab) = \psi(b\Psi(a)) \forall a, b \in \mathcal{A}^\infty$. This modular property of the Haar state is well-known, and has been studied deeply by Woronowicz.

Remark 3.6 *Since $q > 1$, $[x]_q^2 = (q^{2x} + q^{-2x} - 2)(q - q^{-1})^{-2}$ is increasing for x in the positive real line, and thus we can estimate $\text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2)) = \sum_{m=1,2,3,\dots} [m]_q^2 e^{-t(\frac{m+1}{2})^2}$ by,*

$$2 \int_1^\infty [x-1]_q^2 e^{-t(\frac{x+1}{2})^2} dx < \text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2)) < 2 \int_0^\infty [x+1]_q^2 e^{-t(\frac{x+1}{2})^2} dx.$$

From this, it follows by a direct and simple calculation that there are positive constants C_1, C_2, C_3, k depending only on q such that $t^{-\frac{1}{2}} C_1 (\exp(\frac{k}{t}) - C_3) < \text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2)) < C_2 t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \exp(\frac{k}{t})$ for sufficiently small $t > 0$.

This estimate shows that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0^+} t^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{k}{t}} \text{Tr}(\text{Rexp}(-tD^2))$ is nonzero and finite. This is not something expected from classical intuition, since for any classical d -dimensional compact manifold one gets a growth rate of the order $t^{-d/2}$ of $\text{Tr}(e^{-tL})$, where L denotes the square of the Dirac operator.

It is shown in [9] and [8] that the approach with “true” Dirac operator works nicely for q of modulus 1. However, as we have discussed in the present letter, there are problems to extend a similar construction to the case of positive q . On the other hand, the well-developed operator algebraic theory of compact quantum group due to Woronowicz and others accommodates the case of positive q and not the complex ones. We would like to mention in this context that very recently (after a previous version of this article was submitted) Chakraborty and Pal ([10]) have been able to construct spectral triples for $SU_q(2)$ with positive q , which have a nontrivial pairing with the K -theory. However, their construction does not seem to be an extension of the construction of “true” Dirac operators for complex q of modulus 1, although the absolute value $|D|$ (but not $\text{sign}(D)$) of some of the Dirac operators constructed by them will be essentially same as the absolute value of the “true” Dirac operator considered by us in the present article.

Acknowledgements

The author is very much grateful to Prof. K. B. Sinha for many valuable suggestions, comments and encouragement. He would also like to express his deep gratitude to Prof. Alain Connes for pointing out the need of considering the true Dirac operator and kindly clarifying the approach involving the true Dirac operator, together with many other important comments which have helped the author to gain deeper insight of the problem. Special thanks are to be given to Dr. A. K. Pal for pointing out some mistakes in the early manuscript which led to substantial revision and improvement, and to P. S. Chakraborty for numerous suggestions and comments, specially related to Fredholm modules and cyclic cohomology. Finally, the author would like to thank the Av. Humboldt Foundation for the financial support in the form of a Research Fellowship and Prof. S. Albeverio of I.A.M. (Bonn) for his kind hospitality.

References

- [1] P. N. Bibikov and P. P. Kulish, “Dirac operators on the quantum group $SU_q(2)$ and the quantum spheres” (English translation of the original Russian), *J. Math. Sci.* **100**(2)(2000) 2039-2050.
- [2] L. C. Biedenharn and M. A. Lohe, *Quantum groups and q -tensor algebras*, World. Sci., 1995.

- [3] S. Baaĵ and G. Skandalis, “Unitaires multiplicatifs et dualité pour les produits croisés de C^* algbres”, *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup.* **4**(26)(1993) 425-488.
- [4] A. Connes, *Noncommutative Geometry*, Academic Press, 1994.
- [5] A. Connes, “Noncommutative Differential Geometry”, *I.H.E.S. Publ. Math.* **62**(1985) 257-360.
- [6] A. Connes, private communication.
- [7] A. Connes, “Cyclic cohomology and the transverse fundamental class of a foliation”, pp. 52-144 in *Geometric methods in operator algebras (Kyoto, 1983)*, *Pitman Research Notes in Math.* 123, Longman, Harlow, 1986.
- [8] A. Connes and M. Dubois-Violette, “Noncommutative finite-dimensional manifolds. I. Spherical manifolds and related examples”, preprint (math. QA/0107070).
- [9] A. Connes and G. Landi, “Noncommutative Manifolds the Instanton Algebra and Isospectral Deformations”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **221** (2001) 141-159.
- [10] P. S. Chakraborty and A. Pal, “Equivariant spectral triples on the quantum $SU(2)$ group”, preprint, math.KT/0201004.
- [11] V. G. Drinfeld, “Quantum Groups”, pp. 798-820 in *Proc. I. C. M.* (1,2), Berkeley, California, 1986.
- [12] J. Fröhlich, O. Grandjean and A. Recknagel, “Supersymmetric quantum theory and noncommutative geometry”, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **203**(1999) 119-184.
- [13] M. Jimbo, “A q -analogue of $U(gl(N + 1))$, Hecke algebra and Yang Baxter equation”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **11** (1986) 247-252.
- [14] P. Podleś, “Differential calculus on quantum spheres”, *Lett. Math. Phys.* **18**(2)(1989) 107-119.
- [15] S. L. Woronowicz, “Twisted $SU(2)$ -group : an example of a non-commutative differential calculus”, *Publ. R. I. M. S. (Kyoto Univ.)* **23**(1987) 117-181.

- [16] S. L. Woronowicz, “Differential calculus on compact matrix pseudogroups (quantum groups)”, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **122**(1)(1989) 125-170.